UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,987	03/07/2002	Jeremy Alan Arnold	ROC920010332US1	8551

7590   07/30/2004

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/092,987	ARNOLD ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Cam Y T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Helgeson et al (or hereinafter "Helgeson") (US 6643652) in view of

Bodamer et al (or hereinafter "Bodamer") (US 6236997).

As to claim 1, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a code portion" as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory

representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL

selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

"attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL)

statement that corresponds with the code portion" as upon receiving a request to create

an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK

retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

Helgeson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "generating a

recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL

statement". However, Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the

request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from

allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS

database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected

SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17,

lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210

generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from

select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed

to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the

selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query

a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or

enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claims 2, 13 and 20, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation

subject matter in claims 1, 12 and 18, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation

"wherein the recommendation comprises one of a recommended SQL statement and a

textual spoken language recommendation" as (col. 17, lines 45-55)

As to claims 5, 16 and 22, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation

subject matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "prior to

retrieving the corresponding SQL statement, determining whether the code portion can

be modified to be processed more efficiently by substituting the corresponding SQL

statement with the recommended SQL statement". Bodamer teaches the appropriate

module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to convert the SQL

statement from select * from allusers@FDS to select * from (select *Join A, B)@FDS,

which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates the system

determines the appropriate module 210 can be modified to be processed more

efficiently by substituting the SQL statement from select * from allusers@FDS to select *

from (select *Join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210

generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from

select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed

to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the

selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query

a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or

enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claim 6, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject

matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the

recommended SQL statement performs at least one function performed by the code

portion" as (col. 18, lines 20-65).

As to claims 5, 16 and 22, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "prior to generating the recommended SQL statement, retrieving a database type for providing a proper syntax for the recommended SQL statement" as (col. 18, lines 20-60; col. 17, lines 45-55).

As to claims 8, 17, and 23, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the code portion is configured to retrieve independent fields from a database" as (col. 14, lines 15-25).

As to claim 9, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the code portion is in Java" as (col. 28, lines 20-25).

As to claim 10, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation "wherein retrieving the corresponding SQL statement comprises retrieving the corresponding SQL statement from a prior execution of the code portion" as (col. 24, lines 45-50).

As to claim 11, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation "retrieving the corresponding SQL statement from a repository of predefined SQL statements" as (col. 24, lines 45-50).

As to claim 12, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a code portion" as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

"attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL) statement that corresponds with the code portion" as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

Helgeson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "and generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement" "generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement". Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query

a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or

enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claim 18, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

"a memory containing a programming assistance program for an integrated

development environment"; as (col. 4, lines 40-50; col. 5, lines 55-65);

"and a processor which, when executing the programming assistance program,

performs an operation comprising: receiving a code portion" as upon receiving a request

to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the

BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

"attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL)

statement that corresponds with the code portion" as upon receiving a request to create

an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK

retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50).

Bodamer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "and generating a

recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL

statement". However, Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the

request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from

allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS

database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected

SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17,

lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

4.   Claims 3, 4,14, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al (or hereinafter "Helgeson") (US 6643652) in view of Bodamer and further in view of Brown et al (or hereinafter "Brown") (US 2003/0093408).

As to claims 3 and 14, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 12, except the claimed limitation "displaying the recommendation". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

As to claims 4, 15 and 21, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 12, except the claimed limitation "displaying the corresponding SQL statement and the recommended SQL statement". ". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

As to claim 19, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a display device and wherein the operation further comprises displaying the recommendation on the display device". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure

Sheffield (US 5832481).

Contact Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (703) 605-1169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong

07/14/2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER